

App. No. 10/796,704
Office Action Dated February 28, 2006

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1 and 10 and the drawings are hereby amended. Claims 15 and 16 are new.

Amendment of claims 1 and 10 are supported by Figure 1 and page 7, lines 29-33. New claim 15 is supported by Figure 4 and page 14, line 27 to page 15, line 4. New claim 16 is supported by page 18, lines 19-25.

The drawings are objected to for showing a reference number not discussed in the specification. The drawings are amended to address the concerns of the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration of the drawings is requested.

Claims 1-5, 8, and 9 were rejected as being anticipated by Hiroyama (US 5,963,572). Applicants traverse this rejection. Hiroyama does not disclose or suggest a semiconductor laser device including a ridge with a first region where a width of a bottom portion of the ridge is substantially constant in an optical path direction, and a second region where the width of the bottom portion of the ridge is varied continuously in the optical path direction, where the second region is placed between the first region and an end face in an optical path, as required by claim 1. In fact, Hiroyama does not discuss or suggest a width of a bottom portion of a ridge in an optical path direction (e.g. the direction as shown in Figure 2 of the current application). Further, one skilled in the art would not look to Hiroyama, since the reference is not directed to solving issues relating to occurrence of kink caused by the right-left asymmetry of the cross-sectional shape of a ridge, when seen from the optical path direction.

The first and second regions of the ridge of the semiconductor laser device of claim 1 provide a device with a higher output fundamental transverse mode oscillation, a stabilized FFP optical axis, and a reduced R_s .

Favorable reconsideration of claims 1-5, 8, and 9 is requested.

App. No. 10/796,704

Office Action Dated February 28, 2006

Claims 10-14 were rejected as being anticipated by Doi (US 5,679,947). Applicants traverse this rejection. Doi does not disclose or suggest an optical pickup apparatus including a ridge with a first region where a width of a bottom portion of the ridge is substantially constant in an optical path direction, and a second region where the width of the bottom portion of the ridge is varied continuously in the optical path direction, where the second region is placed between the first region and an end face in an optical path, as required by claim 10. In fact, Doi does not discuss or suggest a width of a bottom portion of a ridge in an optical path direction (e.g. the direction as shown in Figure 2 of the current application). Further, one skilled in the art would not look to Doi, since the reference is not directed to solving issues relating to occurrence of kink caused by the right-left asymmetry of the cross-sectional shape of a ridge, when seen from the optical path direction. Favorable reconsideration of claims 10-14 is requested.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165, at (612)455-3802.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 19, 2006

CBH:mfc

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Curtis B. Hamre".

Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No.: 29,165
Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.
225 South Sixth Street
Suite 2650
Minneapolis, MN 55402
612.455.3800